

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/917,539	07/27/2001	R. Dennis Nesbitt	P-3611-2-D1-3-C1 SLD 2 01	3362	
24492 7	590 06/20/2003				
	ITE GOLF COMPANY		EXAMI	EXAMINER DUONG, THANH P	
425 MEADOW PO BOX 901			DUONG, T		
CHICOPEE, MA 01021-0901		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
		¥	3711 DATE MAILED: 06/20/2003	12	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

In

Advisory Action

		9 2
Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/917,539	NESBITT ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Tom P Duong	3711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1 113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in

condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is late no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extensions (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:	
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or	ıe
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.NOTE:	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ıt
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed:	
Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected: as stated in Final Rejection.	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10.□ Other:	
Paul T. Sewell Supervisory Patent Examinêt	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Group.3700

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Cavallaro at column 1, line 66 thru column 2, line 4, specifically indicates that it is desirable to modify two piece balls and that the prior art has devoted much effort to modify two piece balls to provide the feel of a wound ball while providing "the distance, durability and relative ease of manufacturing of a conventional two piece ball", column 3, lines 31-36. Cavallaro '191 stated "the properties such as hardness, Bayshore resilience, modulus, core diameter and mantle layer thickness of the golf balls of the present invention have been found to effect play characteristics such as spin, initial velocity and feel of the present golf balls." (Col. 7,lines 29-33). Cavallaro '191 does not show or teach specifically that the addition of a mantle layer "increases" or decreases the spin rate but merely says the mantle layer has the affect on playing characteristics such as spin and etc. Note, Cavallaro '191 shows a spin rates on Table II which are tested with a Driver while the spin rate on Table III of Sullivan '489 are tested with a #9 iron; thus, it is not a proper comparasion and drawn conclusion. With respect to the remaining remarks, the applied prior art as stated in the final rejection clearly shows and/or teaches the claimed invention. Note that in the disclosed "blends" each resin constitutes reinforcing material dispersed throughout the other resin.